



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/971,137	10/03/2001	Steven D. Ims	RSW920010162US1	4056

46320 7590 07/08/2005

CHRISTOPHER & WEISBERG, PA  
200 E. LAS OLAS BLVD  
SUITE 2040  
FT LAUDERDALE, FL 33301

EXAMINER
----------

HARRELL, ROBERT B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 07/08/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/971,137

Applicant(s)

IMS ET AL.

Examiner

Robert B. Harrell

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 April 2005.  
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 03 October 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☒ Other: see attached Office Action.

2

Art Unit: 2142

1. Claims 1-16 remain presented for examination.
2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.
3. The applicant should use this period for response to thoroughly and very closely proof read and review the whole of the application for correct correlation between reference numerals in the textual portion of the Specification and Drawings along with any minor spelling errors, general typographical errors, accuracy, assurance of proper use for Trademarks <sup>TM</sup>, and other legal symbols ®, where required, and clarity of meaning in the Specification, Drawings (remove inventor information and title to which the Figures are thus objected to), and specifically the claims (i.e., provide proper antecedent basis for “the” and “said” within each claim). Minor typographical errors could render a Patent unenforceable and so the applicant is strongly encouraged to aid in this endeavor.
4. Use of active hyperlink and/or other forms of browser executable code is improper (see MPEP 608.01) and must be removed (see page 14 as one example, all others must also be removed). The reason being many OCR softwares will automatically associate (convert) such as an active (clickable) URL. Also, due to the dynamic nature of such links, they tend to become disabled rather than not in a relatively short time compared to the life of a Patent
5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

**Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.**

6. Claims 11-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, printed matter. The claims recite “A computer program product” that comprises the claimed components. While the components either are or are on a computer useable medium, the product as a whole is not on a computer readable medium (i.e., a computer book having the claimed components in a sleeve on a back folder is a computer program product). This rejection can be overcome most effectively if the claims recite: “A computer program product on a computer readable medium comprising” even if argued that a book (OCR scanning), empty space void of matter, a network wire, dna/rna sequencing, oil on canvas, exc..., are each a medium and each computer readable as known to those in the art (In re Beauregard (CAFC) 35 USPQ2d 1383) and MPEP 2106).

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C 112:

**The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.**

Art Unit: 2142

8. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. The scope of meaning of the following claim language is not clear:

- a) "said identified types"-claim 1 (line 8) [\* note singularity in line 3 "one type" \*];
- b) "said markup"—claim 6 (line 8)[\* note lines 6 and 7; which one? \*];
- c) "said JSP program fragments"-claim 10[\* note claim 9 (line 9 and claim 10 (line 4) \*].

9. As to 8 (a-c) above, these are but a few examples of numerous cases where clear antecedent basis are lacking and not an exhausting recital. Any other term(s) or phrase(s) over looked by examiner and not listed above which start with either "the" or "said" and do not have a single proper antecedent basis also is indefinite for the reasons outlined in this paragraph. Also, these are but a few examples where term(s) or phrase(s) are introduced more than once without adequate use of either "the" or "said" for the subsequent use of the term(s) or phrase(s). Moreover, multiple introduction of a term, or changes in tense, results in a lack of clear antecedent basis for term(s) or phrase(s) which relied upon the introduced term. Failure to correct all existing cases where clear antecedent basis are lacking can be viewed as non-responsive. Nonetheless, should a response yield all claims allowable short *a few* cases where clear antecedent basis are lacking within the claims, a preemptive authorization to enter an examiner's amendment to the record to correct such would accelerate a notice of allowance over a final rejection. Such could be added at the end of an applicant's response with the following statement: "Examiner is hereby authorized, without the need of further contact by examiner, to enter an Examiner's Amendment to correct any cases where antecedent basis are lacking." if the applicant so elects. This does not diminish the applicant's requirement to correct all such cases not so listed in the example few given above nor prohibit any amendments after a notice of allowance by the applicant.

10. It cannot be clearly ascertained where the program product resides (i.e., on a computer readable medium or in some other location).

11. The method claims are indefinite because they lack means for performing the recited steps (i.e., done by humans, machines, or some other unit). Also, the time sequence or order of performing these steps is lacking and uncertain. It cannot be ascertained which group(s) of step(s) is(are) performed prior to, after, or in parallel with another group(s) of step(s).

12. Per claim 6, the last three lines has no unit for performing this act/step leading to a questionable hybrid system/method claim or if an element has been inadvertently forgotten (i.e., who or what performs the recited act/step) and thus with function only, is the claim invoking 35 U.S.C. 112, 6<sup>th</sup> paragraph. Note the " ," in line 9 of the claim.

14. Claims 10 and 15 lack the required period that seems to have been deleted

Art Unit: 2142

15. The claims stand allowable over the art of record since the art of record fails to teach the inventive subject matter defined in the claims. However, per paragraph 3 above, the applicant is required to review the whole of this application for clarity and compliance with the Law and Rules.

16. This action is NOT final.

17. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days from the data of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned (see MPEP 710.02, 710.02(b)).

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert B. Harrell whose telephone number is (571) 272-3895. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and on weekends from 6:00 am to 12 noon Eastern Standard Time.

19. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew T. Caldwell, can be reached on (571) 272-3868. The fax phone number for all papers is (703) 872-9306.

20. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.



ROBERT B. HARRELL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
GROUP 2142